REMARKS

Summary: By this Amendment, claims 1 – 3, 9 and 10 have been amended. Claims 4-8, and 11 – 21 have been canceled. Remarks are presented reviewing the amendments (i) that overcome the Section 112 rejections, and (ii) made to overcome the Section 102 (e) and 103 rejections. Allowance of this Application is respectfully requested.

Response To Claim Objections: Claims 2 and 10 have been amended per the Examiner's recommendations, which are appreciated.

Response To Section 112 Claim Rejections In Action Paragraph 4: Claim 1 has been amended and is believed to overcome the rejections for the following reasons. "Item" refers to a paragraph within Paragraph 4. Item 2: Claim 1 has been amended per the Examiner's recommendation, which is appreciated (added "wherein"). Item 3: Claim 1 has been amended to remove "selected", the basis for the rejection. It is respectfully requested that these amendments be accepted as overcoming the claim rejections of Paragraph 4.

Response To Section 112 Claim Rejections In Action Paragraph 5: Claim 1 has been amended and is believed to overcome the rejections for the following reasons. "Item" refers to a paragraph within Paragraph 5.

Items 2 & 3: Claim 1 has been amended to remove the reference to "any higher", in favor of "another". Specification page 13, paragraph [0047] teaches communication between (i) the claimed "transport " (STP) layer 56 layer and (ii) SEP layer 54 (an example of the "another layer"). "Another" is used in one other instance in the amended claim in lieu of "any higher". As a result, there is only either (i) transport layer, or (ii) "another layer", avoiding the rejections. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Item 4: Claim 2 is believed to be enabled by the specification at Paragraphs [0049] and [0134], for example. Claim 2 recites:

the layer specific header portion defining characteristics utilized by a particular related software stack layer.

Because the parent claim recites only "transport layer" and "another layer", the choices for a "particular related software stack layer" can only be one of the "transport layer" and "another layer". In each case, such interpretation is within the teachings of these exemplary Paragraphs:

[0049] The layer specific SID header includes data that is particularly useful for the specific layer utilizing the SID.

[0134] The open and close SID functions are a generic pair which affect the SCSI, SEP and Transport layers. Figure 11A is a block diagram showing the format of an Open SID 600, in accordance with an embodiment of the present invention. As with most SIDs, the Open SID 600 includes a common header 550, as described above with reference to Figures 10A and 10B. The specific portion of the Open SID header begins with Conn. Type 602, which is Connection Type. The Connection Type can be Stream, Datagram, STP / TCP and MAC / IPv4 / IPv6 selection bits.

It is respectfully submitted that the claimed "characteristics utilized by a particular related software stack layer" is enabled by the reference in Paragraph [0049] to "...specific SID header includes data that is particularly useful for the specific layer utilizing the SID" (emphasis added). Further, the claimed "characteristics utilized by a particular related software stack layer" is enabled by the reference in Paragraph [0134] to the SCSI and SEP layers in addition to the "Transport layer". The SCSI and SEP layers are exemplary of the claimed "another layer". These specific SCSI and SEP layers are not the only layers with which the layer specific SID header is taught to be used, as is made clear by the unlimited nature of the Paragraph [0049] teaching: i.e., "useful for the specific layer utilizing the SID". The teaching is that whatever specific layer utilizes the SID may have a layer specific SID header. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Response To Section 112 Claim Rejections In Action Paragraph 7: "Item" refers to a paragraph within Paragraph 7.

Item 2: Claim 1, parent of rejected claim 3, has been amended and is believed to overcome the rejection of claim 3 based on "selected". For the following reason the amended claim 3 is believed to be definite. There are now two specific buffer descriptors recited, and these are within the still-claimed "plurality of buffer descriptors". It is believed clear to state:

wherein each a selected one of the plurality of buffer descriptors further includes buffer length data, the buffer length data defining a size for the data buffer referenced by the memory address pointer.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Item 3: Claim 7, parent of rejected claim 9, has been canceled and claim 9 has been amended to become dependent on claim 1 and to recite:

the first [a] buffer descriptor from the plurality of buffer descriptors defines transport layer header data.

It is respectfully submitted that the now-claimed reference to the now-claimed "first" buffer descriptor avoids the basis of the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Response To Section 102(e) Claim Rejections In Action Paragraphs 8 - 14: Appreciation is expressed for the Examiner's examination based on "best interpretation".

Consideration of amended claim 1, and the claims dependent thereon, as patentably distinguishing over the cited Connery, et al. 6,246,683, (herein "C"), is respectfully requested.

As amended, claim 1 recites that the network stack interface comprising both a first and a second network stack interface. Also, the target software stack layer is recited as creating the second network stack interface.

Reference has been made to the review of C set forth in the rejection. In paragraph 11, at the bottom of page 8, it is asserted that C teaches that the target software stack layer is one and the same as the transport layer 52, FIG. 3. It is respectfully submitted that C expressly teaches (i) that target software stack layer is item 48, separate from (ii) transport layer 52, FIG. 3, that is taught as a TCP/IP stack 53 (C4, L41). The application 48 is said to do "identification of a target buffer assigned by the application layer process..." (C5, L1-5), and that indicates that application 48 is the target layer, not the transport layer 52.

In paragraph 11, at the bottom of page 8 onto page 9 it is asserted that C teaches that transport layer 52, FIG. 3 "creates the network stack interface and passes the network stack interface to another software stack layer". However, the support for the "creates" was not identified, and only the "to another software stack layer" aspect of "passes" was specified in terms of the layer 50. Further review of C has been made, and no place in C has been identified as teaching that either of the (A) target software stack layer, or (B) the transport layer 52 acts as now claimed:

a target software stack layer creates a second the network stack interface,

In more detail, the application layer 48 issues a request (C4, L54) and no such claimed creation is described. Rather, at C2, L39-42 the request (+ the protocol suite) provide a flow specifcation and an identifier of the target buffer. This is not a providing of a second network stack interface by the target software stack layer 48.

In view of the lack of teaching by C of this now-claimed creation, C also does not teach the further claimed subject of the creation, namely:

the second network stack interface comprises a second buffer descriptor for storing information and the memory address pointer of the first buffer descriptor,

Accordingly, consideration of C as not teaching all of the limitations of amended claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Further, the noted reference to "comparison" by C (page 9, Action Item 2) does not relate to the claimed target software stack layer creating a second network stack interface. Rather, this relates to different buffer descriptors at different layers, and not to what (i.e., not to a claimed "target software stack layer") has created a second network stack interface at a different layer. The avoidance of copying by the comparison thus does not teach the claimed target software stack layer creating a second network stack interface.

In view of these remarks, it is respectfully requested that the amendments to claim 1 be accepted as overcoming the claim 1 rejection in Paragraphs 8-11. Additionally, because all other pending claims are dependent on claim 1, favorable consideration of claims 2, 3, & 9-10 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. A notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may

reach the undersigned at (408) 774-6908. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ADAPP166A). A copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.

Chester E. Martine, Jr.
Reg. No. 19,711

MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Telephone: (408) 774-6908
Customer Number 25920